



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/767,810	01/23/2001	David Francis Meyer	INXT 1014-1	3728
22470	7590	12/28/2005	EXAMINER	
HAYNES BEFFEL & WOLFELD LLP P O BOX 366 HALF MOON BAY, CA 94019			STORK, KYLE R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2178	
DATE MAILED: 12/28/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/767,810

Applicant(s)

MEYER ET AL.

Examiner

Kyle R. Stork

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 October 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-99 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-99 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This non-final office action is in response to the remarks filed 26 October 2005.
2. Claims 1-99 are pending. Claims 1, 21, 40, 61, and 81 are independent. The rejection of claims 7, 11, 24, 28, 45, 51, 65, 71, 84, and 91 under 35 U.S.C. 112 has been withdrawn. The rejection of claims 1-99 under 35 U.S.C. 103 has been withdrawn.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 9-10, 14-15, 40, 49-50, 54-55, 81, 88-89, and 93-94 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dolan et al. (US 5801702, patented 1 September 1998, hereafter Dolan).

As per independent claim 1, Dolan discloses a method for processing an electronic document, the document including a header and a body, the method including:

- Processing the electronic document using a program to automatically identify foci (column 3, lines 27-45: Here, links are parsed from a document and added to a hierarchical graph)

Art Unit: 2178

- Creating a meta-content index corresponding to the identified foci (column 3, lines 27-45: Here, the hierarchical graph acts as the index for the identified foci)
- Combining the meta-content index with the header and the body to provide an enhanced document (column 17, lines 33-58: Here, the navigation file associated with the header and body is displayed in combination with the header and body to create the enhanced document)

Dolan does not specifically disclose use of semantic foci in conjunction with his method. However, Dolan describes previous methods using semantic foci to emphasize portions of a document (column 15, line 66- column 16, line 27: Here, semantic foci are identified and highlighted for emphasis). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined semantic foci with Dolan, since it would have emphasized document portions related to the link index (Dolan: column 15, line 66- column 16, line 27).

As per dependent claim 9, Dolan discloses the method wherein the semantic foci includes a plurality of types of information, the plurality of types including one or more of email addresses, URLs, dates, currency values, organization names, names of people, names of places, names of products, names of drugs, names of sports teams, names of diseases, and phone numbers (column 15, line 66- column 16, line 27: Here, links to HTML documents are disclosed. These are linked to other documents through a URL).

As per dependent claim 10, Dolan discloses the method wherein the meta-content index comprises entries sorted by the plurality of types (Figure 2).

As per dependent claim 14, Dolan discloses the method including associating hyperlinks with the semantic foci and incorporating the hyperlinks into one of the meta-content index and the body (column 15, line 66- column 16, line 27; column 3, lines 27-45: Here, foci are links, extracted from the document and placed into the index. Both the links in the index and the document remain linked to the original resource they reference).

As per dependent claim 15, Dolan discloses the method wherein the meta-content index comprises labels facilitating parsing of the enhanced document (Figure 2: Here, based upon the labels in the index, the foci are categorized).

As per dependent claims 40 and 80, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 1. Claims 40 and 80 are similarly rejected.

As per dependent claims 49 and 88, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 9. Claims 49 and 88 are similarly rejected.

As per dependent claims 50 and 89, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 10. Claims 50 and 89 are similarly rejected.

As per dependent claims 54 and 93, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 14. Claims 54 and 93 are similarly rejected.

As per dependent claims 55 and 94, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 15. Claims 55 and 94 are similarly rejected.

5. Claims 2-5, 21-24, 31-34, 41-45, 61-65, 69-70, 74-75, and 82-84 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dolan and further in view of Hachiya et al. (US 6311195, filed 17 December, 1997, hereafter Hachiya).

As per dependent claim 2, Dolan discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Dolan fails to specifically disclose sending the enhanced electronic document to one or more recipients. However, Hachiya discloses sending the enhanced electronic document to one or more recipients (column 1, line 59- column 2, line 13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Dolan and Hachiya, since it would have allowed a user to easily share information with others (Hachiya: column 1, lines 44-54).

As per dependent claim 3, Dolan discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Dolan fails to specifically disclose wherein the electronic document comprises an electronic mail document. However, Hachiya discloses wherein the electronic document comprises an electronic mail document (column 1, line 59- column 2, line 13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Dolan and Hachiya, since it would have allowed a user to easily share information with others (Hachiya: column 1, lines 44-54).

As per dependent claim 4, Dolan and Hachiya disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 3, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Dolan further discloses converting the electronic document to a markup language format, and wherein the

Art Unit: 2178

meta-content index comprises one or more objects expressed in the markup language adapted for presentation with the body in the enhanced document (Figure 1: Here, the electronic document, in HTML, is displayed with the meta-content index).

As per dependent claim 5, Dolan and Hachiya disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 3, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Hachiya further discloses wherein the electronic document comprises a document in a format compliant with a standard MIME format (column 2, lines 9-13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Hachiya with Dolan and Hachiya, since it would have allowed a user to check the form the information is assembled in order to use the correct tool for display (Hachiya: column 2, lines 9-13).

As per independent claim 21, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claims 1, 2, 9, and 10. Claim 21 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claims 22, 43, 63, and 82, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 3. Claims 22, 43, 63, and 82 are similarly rejected.

As per dependent claims 23, 44, 64, and 83 the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 4. Claims 23, 44, 64, and 83 are similarly rejected.

As per dependent claims 24, 45, 65, and 84, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 5. Claims 24, 45, 65, and 84 are similarly rejected.

As per dependent claims 31 and 74, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 14. Claims 31 and 74 are similarly rejected.

As per dependent claims 32 and 70, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 10. Claims 32 and 70 are similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 33, Dolan and Hachiya disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 21, and the same rejection are incorporated herein. Dolan further discloses adding presentation attributes to entries in the meta-content index within one of the plurality of types according to relationships among the entries within one of the plurality of types (column 6, lines 34-58).

As per dependent claims 34, and 75, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 15. Claims 34 and 75 are similarly rejected.

As per dependent claims 41 and 62, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 40 and 2. Claims 41 and 62 are similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 42 the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 2. Claim 42 is similarly rejected.

As per independent claim 61, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 1, 2, and 3. Claim 61 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 69, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 9. Claim 69 is similarly rejected.



6. Claims 6-8, 25-27, 46-48, 66-68, and 85-87 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dolan and further in view of Gottlieb (US 6446118, field 29 February 2000).

As per dependent claim 6, Dolan discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Dolan fails to specifically disclose identifying a document date within the header and associating a presentation attribute to the at least one date in the meta-content index, the presentation attribute based upon a temporal relationship between the document date and the at least one date. However, Gottlieb discloses identifying a document date within the header (column 4, lines 62-67) and associating a presentation attribute to the at least one date in the meta-content index, the presentation attribute based upon a temporal relationship between the document date and the at least one date (column 5, lines 27-35: Here, the temporal relationship is the general date (today, yesterday, 3 days ago)). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Gottlieb with Dolan, since it would have allowed a user to notify a user of the general time differential a document was received (Gottlieb: column 5, lines 27-35).

As per dependent claim 7, Dolan and Gottlieb disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 6, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Gottlieb further discloses converting the at least one date to canonical form (column 5, lines 27-35: Here, the user can obtain the date in a relative (general) form, or as a specific time). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Gottlieb with Dolan and Gottlieb, since it would have

Art Unit: 2178

allowed a user to specify a form in which to view date information (Gottlieb: column 5, lines 27-35).

As per dependent claim 8, Dolan and Gottlieb disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 6, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Dolan discloses using icons and shapes to present interrelations between data (column 5, lines 50-63). Dolan fails to specifically disclose wherein the presentation attribute comprises a color. However, it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of the applicant's invention that text color may be modified, one example being text editing programs such as Microsoft® Word®. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined the ability to modify text color with Dolan and Gottlieb, since it would have allowed a user to visually emphasize differences between dates.

As per dependent claims 25, 46, 66, and 85 the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 6. Claims 25, 46, 66, and 85 are similarly rejected.

As per dependent claims 26, 47, 67, and 86 the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 7. Claims 26, 47, 67, and 86 are similarly rejected.

As per dependent claims 27, 48, 68, and 87 the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 8. Claims 27, 48, 68, and 87 are similarly rejected.

7. Claims 11, 28, 51, 71, and 90 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dolan and further in view of Nemzow (UW 6721715, filed 21 December 1998).

As per dependent claim 11, Dolan discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 9. Dolan fails to specifically disclose currency values and converting currency values to a canonical form. However, Nemzow discloses currency values and conversion of currency values to a canonical form (column 4, lines 6-17: Here, a currency value may be translated to a canonical form (target currency) for use in web commerce). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Nemzow with Dolan, since it would have allowed a user to convert currency into a standard form for multinational accounting transactions (Nemzow: column 4, lines 48-62).

As per dependent claims 28, 51, 71, and 90 the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 11. Claims 28, 51, 71, and 90 are similarly rejected.

8. Claims 12-13, 29-30, 52-53, 72-73, and 91-92 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dolan and further in view of Bertero et al. (US 6698013, filed 4 October 2000, hereafter Bertero).

As per dependent claim 12, Dolan discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 9, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Dolan fails to specifically disclose annotation within the body. However, Bertero discloses annotation within the

Art Unit: 2178

body (column 11, line 53- column 12, line 14: Here, modified portions of a document (source code) are automatically annotated with a comment specifying information such as user id, time, and date of modification). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Bertero with Dolan, since it would have allowed a user to automatically track document changes (Bertero: column 11, line 53- column 12, line 14).

As per dependent claim 13, Dolan discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 9, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Dolan fails to specifically disclose color coding data. However, Bertero discloses color coding specified foci and the foci within the document (column 17, line 51- column 18, line 2: Here, a foci (search term) is specified. The document is then color coded to identify the foci within the body of the document). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Bertero with Dolan, since it would have allowed a user to easily identify foci within the document (Bertero: column 17, lines 51-54).

As per dependent claims 29, 52, 72, and 91 the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 12. Claims 29, 52, 72, and 91 are similarly rejected.

As per dependent claims 30, 53, 73, and 92 the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 13. Claims 30, 53, 73, and 92 are similarly rejected.

9. Claims 16-20, 35-39, 56-60, 76-80, and 95-99 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dolan and further in view of Abu-Hakima et al. (US 6820237, filed 21 January 2000, hereafter Abu-Hakima).

As per dependent claim 16, Dolan discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Dolan fails to specifically disclose wherein the electronic document includes an attachment, and the processing includes analysis of the attachment. However, Abu-Hakima discloses wherein the electronic document includes an attachment, and the processing includes analysis of the attachment (column 4, line 64- column 5, line 34: Here, an electronic document (e-mail) containing an attachment is disclosed. This attachment is then analyzed and summarized). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Abu-Hakima with Dolan, since it would have allowed a user to automatically obtain the key content of a document (Abu-Hakima: column 3, lines 12-24).

As per dependent claim 17, Dolan discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Dolan further discloses including data within the enhanced document (column 17, lines 33-58). Dolan fails to specifically disclose generating a summary of a document. However, Abu-Hakima discloses generating a summary of a document (column 4, line 64- column 5, line 34). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Abu-Hakima with Dolan, since it would have allowed a user

Art Unit: 2178

to automatically obtain the key content of a document (Abu-Hakima: column 3, lines 12-24).

As per dependent claim 18, Dolan discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Dolan further discloses including data within the enhanced document (column 17, lines 33-58). Dolan fails to specifically disclose generating a summary of the attachment. However, Abu-Hakima discloses generating a summary of an attachment (column 4, line 64- column 5, line 34). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Abu-Hakima with Dolan, since it would have allowed a user to automatically obtain the key content of a document (Abu-Hakima: column 3, lines 12-24).

As per dependent claim 19, Dolan discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Dolan further discloses including data within the enhanced document (column 17, lines 33-58). Dolan fails to specifically disclose text suggesting a key subject, and generating a summary of the document based upon the key subject. However, Abu-Hakima discloses text suggesting a key subject, and generating a summary of the document based upon the key subject (column 3, lines 25-40; column 4, line 64- column 5, line 34). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Abu-Hakima with Dolan, since it would have allowed a user to automatically obtain the key content of a document (Abu-Hakima: column 3, lines 12-24).

As per dependent claim 20, Dolan discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Dolan discloses adding information to the meta-content index (column 3, lines 27-45). Dolan fails to specifically disclose generation of a summary of all or part of the electronic document. However, Abu-Hakima discloses generation of a summary of all or part of the electronic document (column 4, line 64- column 5, line 34). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Abu-Hakima with Dolan, since it would have allowed a user to automatically obtain the key content of a document (Abu-Hakima: column 3, lines 12-24).

As per dependent claims 35, 56, 76, and 95 the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 16. Claims 35, 56, 76, and 95 are similarly rejected.

As per dependent claims 36, 57, 77, and 96 the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 17. Claims 36, 57, 77, and 96 are similarly rejected.

As per dependent claims 37, 58, 78, and 97 the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 18. Claims 37, 58, 78, and 97 are similarly rejected.

As per dependent claims 38, 59, 79, and 98 the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 19. Claims 38, 59, 79, and 98 are similarly rejected.

As per dependent claims 39, 60, 80, and 99 the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 20. Claims 39, 60, 80, and 99 are similarly rejected.

### ***Response to Arguments***

10. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-99 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kyle R. Stork whose telephone number is (571) 272-4130. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Application/Control Number: 09/767,810  
Art Unit: 2178

Page 16

Kyle Stork  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2178

hrs



**STEPHEN HONG**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**